UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-----------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/655,807 | 09/05/2003 | Andreas Kolbe | 7421 US | 7113 |
| 30078 MATTHEW D. | 7590 06/11/200 . RABDAU | EXAMINER | | |
| TEKTRONIX, | | MAIS, MARK A | | |
| 14150 S.W. KARL BRAUN DRIVE P.O. BOX 500 (50-LAW) | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| BEAVERTON, | OR 97077-0001 | 2619 | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 06/11/2008 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|-----------------|--------------|--|
| 10/655,807 | KOLBE ET AL. | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | | |

| | MARK A. MAIS | 2619 | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence add | ress | | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 30 April 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. | | | | | | | |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appetor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: | replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance | t, or other evidence, www. with 37 CFR 41.31; or | hich places the (3) a Request | | | | |
| a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of | dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth inter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE). | date of the final rejection of the FIRST REPLY WAS FI | on. LED WITHIN TWO | | | | |
| have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply original controls. | of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office | ate extension fee e action; or (2) as | | | | |
| The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS | nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of the | | | | | |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, being the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, being they raise new issues that would require further cores (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in beting the proposed amendment of the pr | nsideration and/or search (see NOT w); | E below); | | | | | |
| appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c | | | 10 100000 101 | | | | |
| NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 | 21. See attached Notice of Non-Co | mpliant Amendment (I | PTOL-324). | | | | |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): | | , | , | | | | |
| 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). | | | | | | | |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: | | be entered and an e | xplanation of | | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | | | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | | | | | | |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea | l and/or appellant fail: | s to provide a | | | | |
| 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | | | | | | | |
| 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet. | | | | | | | |
| 12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). | | | | | | | |
| 13. Other: | | | | | | | |
| | /Wing F. Chan/ Supervisory Patent Exar AU 2619 6/9/08 | niner | | | | | |

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Request for Reconsideration fails to place the current Application in condition for allowance. Applicants argue that the rejection under 35 USC 12, second paragraph is incorrect because "passively tapping" is well known to one of ordinary skill in the art and cites outside sources. The examiner respectfully disagrees. The examiner maintains the rejections under both 35 USC 112, second paragraph and 35 USC 102(e) because the term "passively" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. Specifically, the claimed invention physically taps into physical lines [See paragraph 2 of the Final Rejection dated 30 January 2008; See Also paragraphs 19-26 of the same Final Rejection].